



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,637	12/22/2003	Christopher D. Payne	MSFTP513US	7416
27195	7590	09/27/2006	EXAMINER	
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP 24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET CLEVELAND, OH 44114			LAY, MICHELLE K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2628	

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/743,637	PAYNE ET AL.	
	Examiner Michelle K. Lay	Art Unit 2628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2006.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4)  Claim(s) 1-31 and 33-40 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-31 and 33-40 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on 22 December 2003 is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All    b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
  
4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 06/26/2006 has been entered.

### ***Response to Amendment***

The amendment filed 06/26/2006 has been entered and made of record. Claim 32 has been cancelled. Claims 1-31, and 33-40 are pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments, filed 06/26/2006, have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made below.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 37 recites a data packet that is transmitted. Therefore, the data packets reads as a signal where a signal is considered non-statutory subject matter.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 31 is objected to because of the following informalities: The grammar on line 2 of claim 31 is improper. Examiner suggests the claim to read, "The method of claim 26, identifiable content comprising advertisements, images, navigation, body of text, and dynamic text." [markings added for emphasis]. Appropriate correction is required

### ***Drawings***

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the visual reference of claim 8 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure

is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. **Claims 1-9, 12-25, and 38** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Manber et al. (6,920,609 B1) over in view of Cudd et al. (2004/0105127 A1).

Manber teaches the limitations of claims **1-9, 12-25, and 38** with the exception of print preview. However, Cudd teaches forming a printable representation of a document from a web browser.

In regards to claims **1, 5, 7, 21, 22**

Referring to Fig. 2 of Manber, the flow chart illustrates the process of identifying and extracting information from web pages. A model web page is parsed (step 110) into HTML tokens to include tag elements and text elements. Certain tokens are ignored via an option set by the operator [col. 5, line 58 – col. 6, line 17]. At step 140, a website is retrieved via its URL. The page is parsed to produce a pattern sequence for comparison with the stored pattern of the target page to identify related information (150). The results of the comparison are used to extract the desired information from the subsequent page to be stored and/or displayed (claims 5, 7). Any number of subsequent pages maybe retrieved and analyzed with respect to the stored pattern of the target page (claim 22) [col. 6, lines 55 – col. 7, line 28]. Furthermore, whenever a part of the page is received, it is analyzed immediately; that part of the page is parsed and compared with the stored pattern in real-time. If a matching pattern is found, the rest of the page can be discarded [col. 7, lines 31-35]. Such method is implemented within a client device (20) of Fig. 1 or server (30) where all of its components are operator configurable using an application including computer code stored on a hard disk executed using a central processing unit [col. 5, lines 10-15]. Thus it is implicit that the analysis and parsing components reside within the central processing unit. Although Manber fails to explicitly teach static sections, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to set static sections to be ignored since these sections fail to update and no new content is provided.

Cudd teaches the printing of a selected frame. The browser application provides a print preview as shown in Figs. 5A-D to the user for review and possible printing [0067]. Thus, the selected frame to preview is implicitly parsed from the content of the webpage.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the print preview and printing function of Cudd within the system of Manber so that the user can view the section of the page that will be printed prior to physically printing the page. This would be advantageous by printing only the desired content where ink and paper can be conserved.

In regards to claims **2** and **4**, Cudd teaches implementing a print preview as shown in Figs. 5A-D to the user for review and possible printing [0067]. The print preview allows the user to verify if the content is correct (claim 4).

In regards to claim **3**, Cudd teaches the printing of a frame selected by a user. The user drags mouse (2103) across that portion of content, and then selects the print preview icon (306). The browser application provides a print preview as shown in Figs. 5A-D to the user for review and possible printing [0067]. Thus, the user defining the frame to preview is the modified content by the user.

In regards to claims **6** and **24**, Manber teaches identifying an area of interest in the model page and parsing the model page to determine a first string of symbols

associated with the HTML tags. After receiving the second web page, the second web page is parsed and compared to the model page to find the area of interest [col. 3, lines 4-23; col. 6, lines 55 – col. 7, line 28]. Thus, the teachings of Manber identify the area of interest via location. Claims 6 and 24 recites the limitation of ***at least one of*** and therefore, the teachings of Manber reads on the limitation requirements of claims 6 and 24.

In regards to claim **8**, the visuals on the web pages of both Manber and Cudd provide a visual reference of the content of the sections on the page to assist the user in determining whether to remove sections.

In regards to claims **9**, referring to Fig. 20 of Cudd, sections of the page is labeled as shown.

In regards to claim **12**, Manber teaches a model web page is parsed (step 110) into HTML tokens to include tag elements and text elements. Certain tokens are ignored via an option set by the operator [col. 5, line 58 – col. 6, line 17]. Thus, the model web page corresponds to said *feed monitoring component* since the current web pages are compared to the model to identify related information and matching pattern (i.e. layout, etc.).

In regards **13**, Manber teaches certain tokens are ignored via an option set by the operator [col. 5, line 58 – col. 6, line 17]. Therefore, the user can set advertisements and navigation to be ignored. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to set both advertisements and navigation to be ignored since the websites accessed are accessed for the content that the website is generated for.

In regards to claims **14-16**, and **23**, Cudd teaches the printing of a frame selected by a user. The user drags mouse (2103) across that portion of content, and then selects the print preview icon (306). The browser application provides a print preview as shown in Figs. 5A-D to the user for review and possible printing [0067] (claim **23**). Thus, the selected frame to preview is implicitly parsed from the content of the webpage (claims **14, 15**). Additionally, the custom printing application is also capable of printing multiple columns of web pages into a single printed sheet of paper. This allows the user to compress more information onto a single page to make reading easier and to save on paper (claim **16**) [Fig. 9, [0071]]. The same rationale for combining as applied to claim 1 is incorporated herein.

In regards to claims **17** and **18**, claim 17 recites the same limitations as claim 1. Furthermore, any risk is involved when eliminating content from an electronic document. Although the user can set certain tokens to be ignored from the electronic document there is risk that important content may reside within these tokens. Additionally, the

tokens of Manber correspond to a classifier, i.e. classifies what should and should not be displayed (claim 18).

In regards to claims 19 and 20, Manber teaches certain tokens are ignored via an option set by the operator [col. 5, line 58 – col. 6, line 17]. Thus, depending on the compared pattern and tokens, certain sections are set to be ignored, i.e. removed, as recited in claim 19. Furthermore, such is implicitly done by a decision tree where as illustrated in Fig. 2 of Manber, step 160 compares the pattern. Depending on the matching patterns, the desired information is extracted (step 170) and then stored and/or displayed (step 180). Implicitly, if patterns fail to match, no information is extracted (claim 20).

In regards to claim 25, Cudd teaches applying modified layout to the selected content (i.e. the content parsed by the Manber). As shown in Fig. 8 of Cudd, uses width scaling where the width of the content is reduced to a width of the media [0070].

In regards to claim 38, claim 38 recites the same limitations as claim 1. Therefore, the same rationale used for claim 1 is applied. Furthermore, Manber teaches the use of program code executed on a central processing unit that is stored on a hard disk or volatile or non-volatile memory medium to implement the method/system of Manber [col. 5, lines 10-25]. Additionally, Cudd teaches an add-on to the application program that is resident on the hard disk drive and read and controlled in its execution by the processor [0051; 0069].

2. Claims 10, 11, 39 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Manber et al. (6,920,609 B1) over in view of Cudd et al. (2004/0105127 A1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Meyerzon et al. (6,638,314 B1).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application.

Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

Manber in view of Cudd teaches the limitations of claims 10, 11, 39, and 40 with the exception of disclosing a crawler. However, Meyerzon teaches a system/method of retrieving information pertaining to electronic documents on a computer network. A crawl number is associated with the documents to indicate the most recent crawl during which a change to the document was detected [abstract].

In regards to claims **10, 11, and 39**, Meyerzon teaches a webcrawler wherein the mechanism performs a first full crawl wherein a transaction log is “seeded” with one or more document address specifications. The processing includes extracting the data from each of these retrieved documents and storing that data in an index, or other database (said *cache*). A hash value for the document and document’s time stamp are also stored with the document data in the index. The document URL, its hash value, its time stamp, and its crawl number modified are stored in a persistent history map that is used by the crawler to record the documents that it has crawled [col. 5, lines 1-17]. The incremental crawl retrieves only electronic documents that may have changed since the previous crawl. During the web crawls, it is determined if an actual substantive change has been made to the document [col. 5, lines 35-50].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the webcrawler function of Meyerzon with the modified invention of Manber in view of Cudd because it is desirable to have a mechanism by which a user can request a search engine to return only documents that have changed in some substantive way since that prior search [Meyerzon: col. 2, lines 3-5].

In regards to claim **40**, Cudd teaches applying modified layout to the selected content. As shown in Fig. 8 of Cudd, uses width scaling where the width of the content is reduced to a width of the media [0070]. The same rationale for combining as applied to claim 39 is incorporated herein.

3. Claims 26-31, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manber et al. (6,920,609 B1) in view of Cudd et al. (2004/0105127 A1) as applied to claims 1 above, and further in view of Brown et al. (6,356,908 B1).

Manber in view of Cudd teaches the limitations of claims XXX with the exception of thumbnails. However Brown teaches providing a set of thumbnail images of the linked pages.

In regards to claim 26, claim 26 recites the same limitations as claim 1. Therefore, the same rationale used for claim 1 is applied. Furthermore, Brown teaches a set of thumbnail images of the linked pages [*abstract*]. As shown in Fig. 8, Brown teaches displaying a thumbnail associated with a link. The term thumbnail of Brown has been used to describe a small picture representing a visual summary of a bigger picture that is typically a webpage [col. 9, lines 18-21]. Additionally, the thumbnail images may be resizable to allow a user to customize the display to taste [col. 9, lines 38-40].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Manber in view of Cudd to include the thumbnail summary function of Brown so that Internet users have a tool to enable them to make more informed decisions about which links to follow [Brown: col. 2, lines 9-10]. Furthermore, with the thumbnail and summary of the webpage, the user has reference of the origins of the parsed portion of the webpage.

In regards to claim 27, Cudd teaches the printing of a frame selected by a user. The user drags mouse (2103) across that portion of content, and then selects the print preview icon (306). The browser application provides a print preview as shown in Figs. 5A-D to the user for review and possible printing [0067]. Thus, the preview is modified based upon the user defining the frame. Additionally, the custom printing application of Cudd is also capable of printing multiple columns of web pages into a single printed sheet of paper. This allows the user to compress more information onto a single page to make reading easier and to save on paper [Fig. 9, [0071]]. Thus the print preview is modified based upon user preferences. The same rationale for combining as applied to claims 26 and 1 are incorporated herein.

In regards to claim 28, Manber teaches a model web page is parsed (step 110) into HTML tokens to include tag elements and text elements. Certain tokens are ignored via an option set by the operator [col. 5, line 58 – col. 6, line 17]. At step 140, a website is retrieved via its URL. The page is parsed to produce a pattern sequence for comparison with the stored pattern of the target page to identify related information (150). The results of the comparison are used to extract the desired information from the subsequent page to be stored and/or displayed. Any number of subsequent pages maybe retrieved and analyzed with respect to the stored pattern of the target page [col. 6, lines 55 – col. 7, line 28]. Furthermore, whenever a part of the page is received, it is analyzed immediately; that part of the page is parsed and compared with the stored pattern in real-time. If a matching pattern is found, the rest of the page can be

discarded [col. 7, lines 31-35]. Thus, the retrieved website (step 140) is dissected based upon user preferences via the tokens set by the operator (step 110).

In regards to claim 29, Manber teaches any number of subsequent pages maybe retrieved and analyzed with respect to the stored pattern of the target page [col. 6, lines 55 – col. 7, line 28]. Furthermore, whenever a part of the page is received, it is analyzed immediately; that part of the page is parsed and compared with the stored pattern in real-time. If a matching pattern is found, the rest of the page can be discarded [col. 7, lines 31-35]. From the rationale of claim 28, the retrieved website(s) (step 140) are dissected based upon user preferences via the tokens set by the operator (step 110). Furthermore, Cudd teaches the custom printing application of Cudd is also capable of printing multiple columns of web pages into a single printed sheet of paper [Fig. 9, [0071]]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the custom printing of Cudd with the parsed sites of Manber to allow the user to compress more information onto a single page to make reading easier and to save on paper [Cudd: [0071]; Fig. 9].

In regards to claim 30, Cudd teaches printing the previewed document [Fig. 19, (1930) (1924); Fig. 21 (2115)].

In regards to claim 31, as shown in Figs. 1-4B, and 6 of Cudd and Figs. 1, 10, 12, 14 of Brown, the web pages (said identifiable content) contain advertisements, images, navigation (i.e. links), body of text, and dynamic text.

In regards to claim 33, Fig. 8 of Brown teaches providing a summary of the URL and date. The same rationale for combining as applied to claim 26 is incorporated herein.

4. Claims 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cudd et al. (2004/0105127 A1) in view of Brown et al. (6,356,908 B1).

Cudd teaches the limitations of claims 34-36 with the exception of disclosing thumbnails. However, Brown teaches providing a set of thumbnail images of the linked pages.

In regards to claim 34, Cudd teaches the printing of a frame selected by a user. The user drags mouse (2103) across that portion of content, and then selects the print preview icon (306). The browser application provides a print preview as shown in Figs. 5A-D to the user for review and possible printing [0067]. Thus, the selected frame to preview is implicitly parsed from the content of the webpage.

Brown teaches a set of thumbnail images of the linked pages [abstract]. As shown in Fig. 8, Brown teaches a thumbnail displayed next to the summary of the link it is associated with. The term thumbnail of Brown has been used to describe a small picture representing a visual summary of a bigger picture that is typically a webpage

[col. 9, lines 18-21]. Additionally, the thumbnail images may be resizable to allow a user to customize the display to taste [col. 9, lines 38-40]. Note, Applicant's claim reads *at least one of*. Thus, the thumbnail summary satisfies the limitation.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Cudd to include the thumbnail and summary function of Brown so that Internet users have a tool to enable them to make more informed decisions about which links to follow [Brown: col. 2, lines 9-10]. Furthermore, with the thumbnail and summary of the webpage, the user has reference of the origins of the parsed portion of the webpage.

In regards to claim 35, Cudd teaches the printing of a frame selected by a user. The user drags mouse (2103) across that portion of content, and then selects the print preview icon (306). The browser application provides a print preview as shown in Figs. 5A-D to the user for review and possible printing [0067]. Thus, the user defining the frame to preview is user-defined content.

In regards to claim 36, Fig. 8 of Brown teaches providing a summary of the URL and date. The same rationale for combining as applied to claim 34 is incorporated herein.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michelle K. Lay whose telephone number is (571) 272-7661. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30a-5p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kee M. Tung can be reached on (571) 272-7794. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michelle K. Lay  
Patent Examiner  
Division 2628  
09.21.2006 mkl

  
PATENT EXAMINER



KEE M. TUNG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER